



Volume 6: Measuring the Gender Impact of FTF

Gender and Food Security

The FTF Initiative has been developed around the hypothesis that including the poorer and more economically vulnerable populations in agricultural economic growth strategies will have a transformative effect on regional economies – restructuring local production, distribution, and consumption patterns for long-term, sustainable development. Because of women's prominent role in agriculture and the persistent economic vulnerabilities women face, FTF recognizes that reducing gender inequality and empowering women in agriculture is critical to reducing poverty and hunger. Consistent and compelling evidence demonstrates that when the status of women is advanced, agricultural productivity increases, poverty is reduced, and nutrition improves.

Measuring FTF Gender Impact

Gender equality and women's empowerment play a prominent role in FTF hypotheses and strategies, the FTF monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system aims to comprehensively track gender impacts through three main approaches: 1) engendered performance monitoring, 2) gender-focused impact evaluations, and 3) the development and utilization of the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index. Through these three targeted and diverse approaches, USAID will garner a deeper understanding of how FTF has impacted women, men, and the dynamics between them.

1) Engendered Performance Monitoring

The FTF monitoring and evaluation approach is committed to rigorous measurement of the direct impact FTF programs have on beneficiary populations, with a critical focus placed on women. Through sex disaggregated data, FTF can track the impacts of investments on women and men and measure the progress of women's achievements as compared to men's.

For household (HH) level indicators, data should be disaggregated by "gendered household types" – that is: 1) HH with male and female adults, 2) HH with male adult, no female adult, and 3) HH with female adult, no male adult. This categorization is somewhat different than the standard "male-headed vs. female-headed" households, and the distinction and change is very meaningful. The concept of "head of household" is highly loaded, presumes certain characteristics that may or may not be present in household gender dynamics, and often reflects the bias of the researcher or respondent. In addition, the head of household concept may perpetuate existing social inequalities and prioritization of household responsibilities that may be detrimental to women. Although this change is significant conceptually, please note that this should not require major modifications in how data are collected – only how they are categorized and reported into a database.

Below is a summary of these indicators currently found in the FTF Indicator Handbook and Summary of FTF Indicators Table located on the FTF website that are either sex-disaggregated or women specific:

	FTF Indicator Title	Disaggregates	Category	Ind. Type
1	Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day*	Gendered HH type	Required	impact
2	Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age	Sex	Required	impact
3	Per Capita Income (as proxied) by expenditures or assets) of USG targeted beneficiaries.	Gendered HH type	Required	outcome
4	Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age	Sex	Required	impact
5	Prevalence of underweight women	None	Required	impact
6	Prevalence of wasted children under five years of age	Sex	Required	impact
7	Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger	Gendered HH type	Required	impact
8	Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age	None	Required if Applicable	outcome
9	Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months	Sex	Required if Applicable	outcome
10	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet	Sex	Required if Applicable	outcome
11	Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age	None	Required if Applicable	outcome
12	Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age	Sex	Required if Applicable	outcome
13	Gross margin per unit of land or animal of selected product (crops/animals selected varies by country)	Commodity, Gendered HH type	Required if Applicable	outcome
14	Value of incremental sales (collected at farm- level) attributed to FTF implementation	Targeted commodities / Sex	Required if Applicable	outcome
15	Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation	Sex, Job location (Urban/Rural)	Required if Applicable	outcome
16	Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Sex	Required if Applicable	outcome
17	Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	Sex	Required if Applicable	outcome
18	Number of households with formalized land	Sex of landholder	Required if Applicable	outcome
19	Number of rural hectares mapped and adjudicated	Sex of registrant	Required if Applicable	outcome
20	Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans	Sex of loan recipient	Required if Applicable	outcome
23	Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training	Sex	Required if Applicable	output
21	Number of people with a savings account or insurance policy as a result of USG assistance	Sex	Standard	outcome
22	Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training	Sex	Standard	output
24	Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance	Sex	Standard	output
25	Number of stakeholders using climate information in their decision making as a result of USG assistance	Sex	Standard	output
26	Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions	Gendered HH type	Standard	output
27	Number of MSMEs receiving USG assistance to access bank loans	Sex of MSME owner	Standard	output
28	Number of MSMEs receiving business development services from USG assisted sources	Sex of MSME owner	Standard	output
29	Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets	Sex, Type of Asset	Standard	output
30	Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG interventions	Gendered HH type	Standard	output
31	Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs	Sex	Standard	output
32	Number of children under five years of age who received vitamin A from USG-supported programs	Sex	Standard	output
33	Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs	Sex	Standard	output

There are several important points to take into consideration regarding the indicators listed above:

- The higher-level **impact and outcome indicators** highlighted in green will all be collected by an outside contractor for the FTF mission. Missions can either make use of the centrally-funded contractor that BFS is procuring or use/develop their own M&E contract. It will be very important for missions to review the survey tools the contractors will use to collect indicator data to make sure that they are properly designed to collect appropriately disaggregated data.
- For the program- and project- level **outcome indicators** highlighted in orange above, data collection will be conducted by implementing entities. It is very important that missions spend time with their implementing partners identifying those FTF indicators that can appropriately monitor project performance and be disaggregated by sex. Missions should exhaust all opportunities to drill down on the gender impact of each and every project funded by FTF.
- For the project level **output indicators** highlighted in blue, data for baselines and monitoring will also be collected by implementing entities. Implementing partners must clearly understand missions' need for high levels of women's participation in projects and the need for these output indicators to be sex-disaggregated and reported as such. Performance Management Plans should indicate the level of participation of women in or proportion of women benefiting from FTF-funded activities -- actual and planned targets -- and are a critically important portfolio management tool to "get it right up front". If an implementing entity's "reach" of women in activities is lacking, it is important to adjust appropriately early on in project implementation.

2) Gender-Focused Impact Evaluation

USAID recently launched Evaluation Policy which states:

"Evaluation provides the information and analysis that prevents mistakes from being repeated and that increases the chance that future investments will yield even more benefits than past investments. While it must be embedded within a context that permits evidence-based decision making and rewards learning and candor more than superficial success stories, the practice of evaluation is fundamental to the Agency's future strength."

FTF has developed a Learning Agenda that outlines critical questions about the effectiveness of FTF programming that the Initiative seeks to answer, primarily through impact evaluations. Improved Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment is one of six themes under the Learning Agenda, and the prioritized questions FTF seeks to answer under that theme are:

1. Have FTF interventions to increase inclusive agricultural sector growth and improve nutrition increased women's participation in paid employment and increased their incomes; reduced gender gaps in terms of production inputs; and/or improved the empowerment of women? Which interventions have generated the greatest impacts?
2. Have FTF supported capacity-building and increased leadership/management opportunities for women led to increased participation of women in leadership roles in the community?
3. Have FTF programs that emphasize gender equality and the empowerment of women led to reduced poverty and hunger?
4. Have FTF interventions advancing commercialization in value chains:
 - changed access to, ownership of, or control over land for men and women?
 - affected access to paid employment or types of employment for men and women?
 - led to increases or decreases in unpaid work for men or women?

5. How have FTF interventions changed decision-making by women and men on agricultural production, nutrition, and use of income?
6. Have FTF interventions changed risk-reduction strategies pursued by men and women to cope with shocks (health-related, agro-climatic, economic, socio-political)?

Missions have a great opportunity to design impact evaluations that integrate questions on how FTF approaches effectively contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment. The following are some important gender-related points to take into consideration as you develop your impact evaluation agenda and specific impact evaluation designs:

- A **gender specialist** should review each and every project approach to identify where there may be risks in participation and direct benefit by women. These risks in approach could potentially represent very interesting questions that could be answered through impact evaluations;
- Missions should exhaust opportunities within impact evaluation design to **include sex-disaggregated** data collection and **analysis of outcomes and impacts**. This provides the possibility to demonstrate where appropriate whether men and women are achieving similar levels of results, or whether there are noticeable differences which should be investigated.
- When developing their impact evaluation agendas, missions should think through each of the **development hypotheses** they want to test and consider how **gender concerns** might relate to the hypotheses. For example, if the hypothesis considers that changes to processes to formalize land and increase individual land rights will improve agricultural productivity in certain value chains, the missions should think through what the formalization process and increased land rights will mean for both women, men, and the dynamics between them in terms of agricultural production. Specific evaluation questions should be developed to address those concerns.

3) The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index

Women are a primary focus of USAID Feed the Future's (FTF) first-level objective, "Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth", a concept which is both broad and multi-dimensional. To simplify the objective's measurement, the FTF initiative further defines the concept and women's relationship to it as "the improvement of women's roles and engagement throughout the various areas of the agriculture sector, as it grows, in both quantity and quality" and operationalizes that improvement by measuring change in the following domains:

- Women's role in household decision-making around agricultural production
- Women's access to productive capital
- Women's income and expenditures
- Women's individual leadership and influence in the community
- Women's time allocations

To measure changes in Women's Empowerment in Agriculture through those five domains, the BFS is developing an index in partnership with the PPL Bureau, International Food Policy and Research Institute (IFPRI), and the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI), Department of International Development at the University of Oxford. Researchers at IFPRI have developed the precise variables that measure aspects of each of the five domains outlined above and have developed the survey instrument that have been used to collect the data for the variables. OPHI is creating the Index using the Alkire-Foster method for measuring multi-dimensional concepts. For more information on the method, please see OPHI's website <http://www.ophi.org.uk/research/multidimensional-poverty/alkire-foster-method/>.

The innovative Index is currently under development. Data have been gathered in Bangladesh, Uganda and Guatemala. BFS projects that the Index will be available to the public in March 2012. Although the Index will not be public until March 2012, the pilot version is available to missions that are in the process of collecting baselines. Data for this indicator should be collected through a population-based survey conducted by an M&E contractor.

The Index will be used for both performance monitoring and impact evaluation purposes. Missions should use the Index for impact evaluations when they feel it is appropriate and useful. For performance monitoring, data for the Index should be collected every two years with a representative sample in the mission's Zone of Influence.